



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/866,454	05/25/2001	James L. Rice III	43406.22.2	4122
7590 11/08/2005				
JAMES L. RICE III 2115 PENN AVENUE S. MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55405			EXAMINER VU, THONG H	
			ART UNIT 2142	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 11/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/866,454

Applicant(s)

RICE, JAMES L.

Examiner

Thong H. Vu

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 9/09/05.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 132-202 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 132-202 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

1. Claims 132-202 are pending.
2. Per communication on 10/19/05, Applicant confirmed claim 139 and 140 depend on claim 137; claim 148 depends on claim 143 and claim 149 depends on claim 148.
Not new matter has been added.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 131-202 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The applicant should use this period for response to thoroughly and very closely proof read and review the whole of the application for correct correlation between reference numerals in the textual portion of the Specification and Drawings along with any minor spelling errors, general typographical errors, accuracy, assurance of proper use for Trademarks (tm), and other legal symbols ®, where required, and clarity of meaning in the Specification, Drawings, and specifically the claims (i.e., provide proper antecedent basis for "the" and "said" within each claim). Minor typographical errors could render a Patent unenforceable and so the applicant is strongly encouraged to aid in this endeavor.

Claims 143,144,146,148 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. (i.e.: such as email or web page are indefinite).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 132-135, 141, 142, 151-163, 171, 177, 180-182, 187-195 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lazaridis et al [Lazaridis, 6,219,694] in view of Shachar [5,923,736].

4. As per claim 132, Lazaridis discloses A method to allow a user of a local computer to access a computer file, the method comprising the steps of:

(a) providing a communications network [Lazaridis, Internet 18, Fig 1];

(b) detecting over said communications network the activation by the user [Lazaridis, server detects event from users, col 4 lines 19-38];

(c) operating on a computer remote from said user an application program compatible with or capable of loading and operating upon the computer file, and has a graphic user interface [Lazaridis, the redirector software makes information appear transparent to the user, col 10 lines 10-20];

(d) opening the computer file in the application program running on remote computer [Lazaridis, remote device, send text, video, audio to the target systems, col 6 lines 7-30]; and

(e) operating a thin client of the terminal emulation type on the local computer (i.e. a palm computer), the thin client allowing the user to provide input to and receive output from the application program running on the remote computer, whereby control and protection of the computer file is retained, while providing simple and easy access to the user via said server-based applications delivered via thin client [Lazaridis, palm

top computer, seamless, transparent redirection of user-selected data items, col 6 lines 31-48].

An Official Notice is taken that the thin client or diskless terminal or emulate terminal are interchangeable [see Faybishenko, Szlam references]

However Lazaridis does not explicitly detail “the activation by the user of a hyperlink associated with the computer file”.

It was well-known in the art that a HTML service module can detect the user ‘s interaction with a hyperlink which is associated with a computer file [Shachar, col 13 lines 32-40]; [Goldberg, a detection of an activation of a hyperlink by the user, col 37 lines 50-55]

Therefore it was obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the detection the activation of a hyperlink by user as taught by Shachar into the Lazaridis’ apparatus in order utilize the server detection process. Doing so would provide more capabilities than are required just for access online services [Shachar, col 5 lines 7-12]

5. As per claim 133, Lazaridis-Shachar disclose the hyperlink contains a unique identifier (i.e.: html tags, URLs), and associating the unique identifier with **metadata** identifying the computer file [Shachar, database, col 1 lines 30-47].

6. As per claim 134 Lazaridis-Shachar disclose the application program is associated with the computer file after the activation of the hyperlink is deleted as inherent feature of HTML file.

7. As per claim 135, Lazaridis-Shachar disclose multiple application programs are available to be associated with the computer file, and the associated application program is selected based on selection criteria chosen from the group comprising: (a) legal rights of the user to use the application programs as a design choice; (b) capabilities of the application programs; and (c) properties that are associated with the hyperlink [Lazaridis, configured to create triggering events, col 2 line 67 et seq.].

8. As per claim 141 Lazaridis-Shachar disclose contains the similar limitations set forth in claim 132 except (g) an initiator component that, upon detection of the hyperlink activation, opens the computer file in said application program and transmits the graphical user interface of said application program to the thin client operating on the remote computer, whereby control and protection of the computer file is retained, while giving appropriate access to recipients via said server-based applications delivered via thin client [Lazaridis, intranet based program, col 4 lines 19-38].

9. Claims 142,187 Lazaridis-Shachar disclose the at least one processing unit is selected from the group consisting of (a) a single server; (b) a personal computer; and

(c) multiple, separate computers operating as a single, logical server [Lazaridis, LAN, col 10 lines 21-38].

As per claim 151, Lazaridis-Shachar disclose contains the similar limitations set forth in claim 132 except (i) providing computer software executable code on said computer server system for transmitting the human interface of said file-compatible server-based computer application to the at least one remote recipient user computer and to receive inputs to said interface from the at least one hyperlink recipient user [Shachar, hyperlink, col 16 lines 48-67, Fig 11].

10. As per claim 152, Lazaridis-Shachar disclose providing computer software executable code for creating said application file hyperlink and associating the hyperlink with said at least one computer file [Shachar, hyperlink, col 16 lines 48-67, Fig 11].

11. Claim 153, Lazaridis-Shachar disclose providing computer software executable code for transmitting said application file hyperlink to said at least one hyperlink recipient user [Shachar, col 13 lines 32-40];

12. Claims 154-156, Lazaridis-Shachar disclose said communications network comprises an Internet; a local area network; a uniform resource locator [Lazaridis, Internet, LAN, email, Fig 1].

13. Claim 157, Lazaridis-Shachar disclose (a) disassociating said application file hyperlink from said at least one computer file; and (b) associating said application file hyperlink with at least one different computer file [Shachar, hyperlink, col 16 lines 48-67, Fig 11].

14. Claim 158, Lazaridis-Shachar disclose modifying the application interface capability function settings of said file-compatible server-based computer application [Shachar, GUI services, col 15 lines 5-32].

15. Claim 159, Lazaridis-Shachar disclose the recipient user computer is of a type selected from the group consisting of: (a) a personal computer; (b) a personal digital assistant; (c) a web or internet appliance device; and (d) a television set-top box as inherent feature of web applications.

16. Claim 160, Lazaridis-Shachar disclose the graphical user interface of said computer software executable code comprises a web page form [Shachar, HTML, Fig 2].

17. Claim 161, Lazaridis-Shachar disclose providing computer software executable code on said computer server system whereby said recipient user's access to and manipulation of said at least one computer file is variable and can be set for specific sessions according to specified parameter [Shachar, permit access, col 8 lines 5-16].

18. Claim 162, Lazaridis-Shachar disclose a partially disabled file-compatible server-based application [Shachar, permit access, col 8 lines 5-16].

19. Claim 163, Lazaridis-Shachar disclose said file restriction means comprises a partially disabled thin-client application means [Lazaridis, palm top computer, seamless, transparent redirection of user-selected data items, col 6 lines 31-48].

20. Claim 171,177 Lazaridis-Shachar disclose (a) providing executable code on said computer server system for producing a computer visual interface desktop work area, (b) providing access to or links to said file-compatible application on the visual interface desktop, (c) providing access to or links to zero or more additional applications on the visual interface desktop, (d) providing access to or links to said at least one computer file or document on the visual interface desktop; and wherein said thin client means on said at least one remote recipient computer are adapted to receive and display said computer visual interface desktop work area [Shachar, permit access, col 8 lines 5-16].

21. Claim 180 Lazaridis-Shachar disclose providing means for at least one additional user using at least one additional remote user computing device to view and optionally interact with the interface of said file-compatible server-based computer application, whereby the additional user and the first hyperlink recipient user may engage in

simultaneous collaboration over said file [Lazaridis, intranet based program, col 4 lines 19-38].

22. Claim 181 Lazaridis-Shachar disclose providing subscription means associated with said service whereby a remote hyperlink recipient user who is not a subscriber of said entity is solicited to subscribe to said service [Shachar, permit access, col 8 lines 5-16].

23. Claim 182 Lazaridis-Shachar disclose a log of accesses to said computer file is kept on said computer server system [Shachar, permit access, col 8 lines 5-16].

24. Claim 188 Lazaridis-Shachar disclose the computer software executable code which detects the execution of the hyperlink recipient user operates on a computing device physically separate from remainder of said server system but connected through said communications network [Shachar, col 13 lines 32-40].

25. Claim 189 Lazaridis-Shachar disclose one of multiple separate computers operating as a single logical server comprises computer operating as an application server [Lazaridis, email sub system 44, Fig 3].

Art Unit: 2142

26. Claim 190 Lazaridis-Shachar disclose the computer file is stored on a storage device directly connected to the remote computer [Lazaridis, directly to desktop system, col 13 lines 5-18].

27. Claim 191 Lazaridis-Shachar disclose downloading the thin client from the server system to said at least one remote recipient user computing device [Lazaridis, palm top computer, col 6 lines 31-48].

28. Claim 192 Lazaridis-Shachar disclose downloading the thin client occurs only after said at least one remote recipient user computing device is examined and found not to already have the thin client available [Lazaridis, palm top computer, col 6 lines 31-48].

29. Claim 193 Lazaridis-Shachar disclose opening the computer file occurs only after a determination is made that the hyperlink associated with the computer file is still active [Shachar, col 13 lines 32-40].

30. Claim 194, Lazaridis-Shachar disclose changes are made to the computer file after the hyperlink is created, and the hyperlink remains associated with the latest version of the computer file [Shachar, col 13 lines 32-40].

31. Claim 195, Lazaridis-Shachar disclose the application program is not operating on the remote computer until after the activation of the hyperlink is detected [Shachar, col 13 lines 32-40].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 172-176 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as obvious over Lazaridis et al [Lazaridis, 6,219,694] in view of Beer et al [Beer, col 5,864,676].

32. Claim 172 Lazaridis discloses (a) detecting said hyperlink activation and (c) opening the file copy in said file-compatible server-based application instead of the original computer file,

However Lazaridis does not explicitly detail assigning a **guest account** to said recipient user; and (b) creating a copy of said at least one computer file in the guest account;

It was well-known in the art that the guest/visitor/temporary account was created for the short time user on network such as Internet user. A skilled artisan would have motivation to improve the thin client access to Internet and found Beer teaching. Beer taught URL login wherein the guest account is used for the URL login [Beer, guest account, col 1 lines 29-38; java applet, col 1 lines 59-col 2 line 7; col 3 lines 48-55]

Therefore it would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the guest account as taught by Beer into the Lazaridis s apparatus in order to utilize the thin client. Doing so would provide the security to the thin client to access and execute Internet application locally.

33. Claim 173, Lazaridis-Beer disclose the guest account is created after detecting said hyperlink activation [Beer, guest account, col 1 lines 29-38].

34. Claim 174, Lazaridis-Beer disclose (a) deleting said guest account upon the closing the computer file by the user, or (b) deleting or cleaning data items from said guest account and returning said guest account to available status upon the closing of the computer file by the user [Beer, guest account, col 1 lines 29-38; java applet, col 1 lines 59-col 2 line 7;col 3 lines 48-55].

35. Claim 175, Lazaridis-Beer disclose predefining a plurality of guest accounts, and further wherein one of the predefined guest accounts is assigned to the user after hyperlink activation [Beer, guest account, col 1 lines 29-38; java applet, col 1 lines 59-col 2 line 7;col 3 lines 48-55].

36. Claim 176, Lazaridis-Beer disclose the [Beer, guest account, col 1 lines 29-38; java applet, col 1 lines 59-col 2 line 7;col 3 lines 48-55] is unassigned or returned to

available status upon the closing of the computer file by the user [Beer, guest account, col 1 lines 29-38; java applet, col 1 lines 59-col 2 line 7; col 3 lines 48-55].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 136-140, 143-150, 165, 166, 170, 183-186, 196-200 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as obvious over Lazaridis et al [Lazaridis, 6,219,694] in view of 923,736] and further in view of Shiigi [6,304,98 B13].

37. As per claim 136, Lazaridis-Shachar disclose A method for handling incoming e-mails at an e-mail gateway [Lazaridis, gateway, email, col 6 lines 1-67] see claim 132 rejection except:

(g) operating a thin client on a local computer used by the recipient, the thin client allowing the recipient to provide input to and receive output from the application program running on the remote computer, whereby the file (email) attachment cannot pose a virus danger to said local computer since it is manipulated remotely, and whereas the local computer has no need of a compatible program to open said attachment [Lazaridis, intranet based program, col 4 lines 19-38; Shachar, permit access, col 8 lines 5-16].

However Lazaridis-Shachar does not detail explicitly the electronic file as email attachment. A skilled artisan would have motivation to modify the Lazaridis's apparatus and found Shiigi teaching.

In the same endeavor, Shiigi discloses an electronic messaging system using JAVA applet (i.e.: thin client), Email server and gateway to send email with attachments [Shiigi, col 4 lines 43-63;col 5 line 34-col 6 line 67;col 7 lines 1-65]

Therefore it would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the technique of using Email over the thin client with Java applet into Lazaridis-Shachar apparatus. Doing so would allow the web user compose, manipulate, send and view or print handdrawn email message.

38. As per claim 137 contains the similar limitations set forth in claim 136. Therefore claim 137 is rejected for the same rationale set forth in claim 136.

39. As per claim 138, Lazaridis-Shachar-Shiigi disclose imposing file access restrictions on said attachment copy [Shiigi, file attachment, col 7 lines 1col 8 line 30].

40. As per claims 139,140 Lazaridis-Shachar-Shiigi disclose setting a variable level of file access restrictions based upon a security level associated with the recipient, whereby attachment access can be varied according to the trust placed in a particular recipient individual as represented by said security level [Shiigi, authenticate, password, col 8 lines 35-67].

41. As per claim 143 contains the similar limitations set forth in claim 136. Therefore claim 143 is rejected for the same rationale set forth in claim 136.

42. As per claims 144,146,148 Lazaridis-Shachar-Shiigi disclose (a) providing application hyperlink generation means on said computer server system for creating said application hyperlink; and (b) providing application hyperlink transmission means for transmitting said application hyperlink to said at least one recipient user, whereby a wide variety of potentially anonymous users are provided simple and easy access to said server-based communications applications delivered via thin client, irrespective of the operating system and the overall capabilities of the recipient's computer, and allowing effortless access to virtually any communications application to be placed anywhere a hyperlink can be placed, **such as** an email or web page [Lazaridis, palm top computer, col 6 lines 31-48].

43. As per claim 145, Lazaridis-Shachar-Shiigi disclose a first communications means consisting of a communications program or application Shiigi, java applet, col 4 lines 43-63;col 5 line 34-col 6 line 67;col 7 lines 1-65].

44. As per claims 147, 149,170,184 Lazaridis-Shachar-Shiigi disclose said first and second communications means comprises programs selected from the group consisting of: (a) an email program (b) an instant messaging program: (c) a voice-over-internet-

protocol program; (d) a video conferencing program; and internet relay chat application as inherent features of Internet applications.

45. As per claim 150, Lazaridis-Shachar-Shiigi disclose providing access to said computer visual interface desktop to subscribers of said commercial service, whereby said application hyperlink recipient may utilize said visual interface desktop in a manner similar to accessing a personalized home web page which utilizes HTML or javascript code, but with the full functionality of standard software applications instead of the limited functionality of said HTML or javascript code [Shiigi, col 4 lines 43-63; col 5 line 34-col 6 line 67; col 7 lines 1-65].

46. Claim 165, Lazaridis-Shachar-Shiigi disclose said file restriction means are varied depending upon parameters of said specific session selected from the group consisting of: (a) the identity of said hyperlink recipient user; (b) the network address of said hyperlink recipient user; (c) whether a qualifying action has been performed by said recipient user; and (d) whether authentication information has been provided by said hyperlink recipient user [Shiigi, authenticate, col 8 lines 35-67].

47. Claim 166, Lazaridis-Shachar-Shiigi disclose said authentication information is selected from the group consisting of: (a) a password; (b) the network address of said hyperlink recipient user; (c) a digital signature, and (d) information provided via the HTTP authentication protocol [Shiigi, authenticate, password, col 8 lines 35-67].

48. Claim 183 Lazaridis-Shachar-Shiigi disclose notifying at least one designated user upon the occurrence of hyperlink access events [Shiigi, notify to client, col 8 lines 16-30].

49. Claim 185 Lazaridis-Shachar-Shiigi disclose said notification includes details about said hyperlink access events [Shiigi, notify to client, col 8 lines 16-30].

50. Claim 186 Lazaridis-Shachar-Shiigi disclose said details about said hyperlink access events comprises data selected from the group consisting of (a) details about said hyperlink recipient user;(b) the time of activation of said application file hyperlink; (c) information about said file associated with said application file hyperlink; (d) the network location of said hyperlink recipient user; (e) information about any changes to said data file [Shiigi, notify to client, col 8 lines 16-30].

51. Claim 196 Lazaridis-Shachar-Shiigi disclose (g) forwarding said incoming email without the attached file to the intended member user's email account; and (h) said member user accessing said attached data file by activating said application file hyperlink [Shiigi, recipient's Email box, col 7 lines 67; web page col 7 lines 54].

52. Claim 197 Lazaridis-Shachar-Shiigi disclose (a) the provision of valuable consideration by said recipient user in exchange for rights to use available file-

compatible application; (b) the provision by said recipient user of information authenticating the recipient user's legal rights to use available file-compatible applications [Shiigi, authenticate, col 8 lines 40-45]; and (c) the subscription by said recipient user to rights to use said available file-compatible application [Shachar, permit access, col 8 lines 5-16].

53. Claim 198 Lazaridis-Shachar-Shiigi disclose (a) providing a user group comprising at least one member user with access to an email account [Shiigi, recipient's Email box, col 7 lines 67; web page col 7 lines 54];

54. Claim 199 contains the similar limitations set forth in claim 198. Therefore claim 199 is rejected for the same rationale set forth in claim 198

55. Claim 200 Lazaridis-Shachar-Shiigi disclose centrally setting parameters of the file access and manipulation restrictions for said user group (a) information about optimum applications for viewing of said file; (b) information about optimum applications for manipulation of said file; (c) said recipient user's legal rights to use available file-compatible applications; (d) usage permissions associated with said available file-compatible applications as inherent features of manipulate the authentication [Shiigi, manipulate, col 2 lines 52-64].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 164, 167-169 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as obvious over Lazaridis et al [Lazaridis, 6,219,694] in view of Felciano et al [Felciano, 6,052,730].

56. Claim 164, Lazaridis does not disclose said file access and manipulation restrictions (i.e.: permission) are selected from the set consisting of:

(f) whether said data file or portions thereof may be copied onto the local computer memory clipboard of the remote recipient user computing device;

However Lazaridis does not detail

(a) whether the data file may be accessed; (b) a number of times the data file may be accessed [Felciano, tracking access, col 2 lines 20-48];

(c) a particular time period during which the file may be accessed [Felciano, perform periodic web searches, col 7 lines 43-67];

(d) whether said hyperlink recipient user may print (i.e.: view) the data file locally [Felciano, viewing the page, col 5 lines 35-42];

(e) whether said hyperlink recipient user may save (i.e.: stored) said first data file locally onto said remote recipient user computing device [Felciano, storing and tracking, col 4 lines 37-65];

(g) whether, after alteration by said recipient user, said data file or portions thereof may be saved onto said computer server system, whereby the original copy of said data file is replaced by the altered file, and said application file hyperlink is now associated with said altered file, and (h) whether, after alteration by said recipient user, said data file or portions thereof may be saved onto said computer server system, whereby the original copy of said data file is not replaced by the altered file and remains on the storage system of said server system [Felciano, permits task to be performed, original file or URL, modified URL, col 4 lines 21-35].

It was well-known in the art of Internet that the internet information can be monitored (i.e.: customer, visitor hits) or print or stored in local memory (i.e.: saving download file) or edit file by recipient as taught by Felciano [Felciano, perform periodic web searches, col 7 lines 43-67; viewing the page, col 5 lines 35-42; storing and tracking, col 4 lines 37-65; permits task to be performed, original file or URL, modified URL, col 4 lines 21-35].

Therefore it would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the technique of modifying web session as taught by Felciano into the Lazaridis's apparatus in order to utilize the applet. Doing so would provide the Web client a dynamic tool to modify hypertext browsing activities.

57. Claims 167-169, Lazaridis-Felciano disclose said qualifying action is accepting an agreement; said agreement obligates the recipient user to limit disclosure of the

Art Unit: 2142

content of said data file; said agreement is a license agreement [Felciano, a simple rule, col 4 lines 1-8].

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner *Thong Vu*, whose telephone number is (571)-272-3904. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:00AM-3:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, *Andrew Caldwell*, can be reached at (571) 272-3868. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Thong Vu
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2142

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Thong Vu', with a horizontal line underneath.